



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,544	12/28/2001	Randall Rex Calvert	501059.01	4703

7590

06/24/2003

Steven H. Arterberry, Esq.
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Suite 3400
1420 Fifth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101

EXAMINER

LEWIS, RALPH A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3732

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
10/035,544

Applicant(s)
Calvert

Examiner
Ralph Lewis

Art Unit
3732



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ralph Lewis

(3) _____

(2) Steven Arterberry

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jun 6, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: pending claims

Identification of prior art discussed:

Billet et al (6,183,253 B1), Vari (5,503,559)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached: g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant pointed to passages in Billet et al (the primary reference applied in the Office Action) which indicate that the elongated body is not fully polymerized (e.g. column 3, lines 49-64 and column 4, lines 33-35) and proposed amending the independent claims to include the limitation that the "elongated body" was fully polymerized. The examiner indicated that the limitation would appear to overcome the rejection as applied in the Office Action, but that the other cited references appeared to show the proposed feature. The examiner indicated that he would call early next week after further reviewing the references.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Ralph A. Lewis
Primary Examiner

Au3732

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required